

REMARKS

Claims 3-22 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 18 and 21 are amended herein. No new matter has been added. Claims 3-22 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 2 were previously cancelled. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated May 31, 2007, are respectfully requested.

I. Rejections Under 35 § 102(e)

The Prior Art (Firouzgar)

Firouzgar, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0195441, apparently teaches a remotely controllable stimulator which is packaged in a device similar to a sanitary napkin. The stimulator provides sexual stimulation of a female via the clitoris.

Firouzgar shows a vibrating device as being integral to the stimulator. Firouzgar shows an "active.-device" as initiating the stimulation. Firouzgar shows wireless connectivity as being integral to the system. Firouzgar states the stimulator can be controlled via the internet using a computer. Firouzgar limits the invention to vibrators found in pagers as follows: "The present invention makes advantageous use of vibrators of the type utilized in vibrating pagers."

Firouzgar does not teach the use of a web browser in the instruction of the stimulator. Firouzgar does not teach that images of the device controlled are available to a user instructing the stimulator. Firouzgar does not teach that the device provides the user with an animated display of the device being controlled.

The Prior Art Distinguished (Firouzgar)

The Examiner relies upon Firouzgar to reject claims 18 and 20 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of the claim.

Claim 18 recites "wherein, an animated display emulating the behavior of the stimulation device is displayed on the on the remote computer." This limitation is not taught by Firouzgar. Claim 18 is therefore allowable.

Claim 20 is directly dependent on claim 18 and thereby includes its limitations. As described above, independent claim 18 is allowable over the teachings of Firouzgar. Accordingly, claim 20 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable claim.

II. Rejection Under 35 § 103(a):

The Prior Art (Sexton)

Sexton, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0068983, apparently teaches a system and method for controlling and monitoring an industrial controller using a portable wireless device.

Sexton shows a programmable logic controller in communication with a local server. The remote device is monitored by the local server. Sexton limits PLC as follows "PLC 16 is used to control an industrial process (not shown) by outputting control signals or commands in response to various inputs.

Sexton does not teach that the device can be used to sexually stimulate an individual. Sexton does not show that an animated display of the stimulation device is displayed on a remote computer. Sexton does not teach that an animated display emulating the behavior of an electromechanical device is displayed on the on a remote computer.

The Prior Art Distinguished

The examiner relies on Firouzgar and Sexton to reject claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Firouzgar and Sexton. To render a claim obvious, the prior art references must include each and every element of the claim.

Claim 19 depends from claim 18. Claim 18 recites "wherein, an animated display of the stimulation device is displayed on the remote computer." This limitation is neither taught nor suggested by Firouzgar or Sexton or the combination thereof. Claim 19 is therefore allowable.

The Prior Art (Nixon)

Nixon, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0130846, apparently teaches a portable computer for use in interfacing with a process control system.

Nixon shows a portable computer having a display that enables a user to interface with a process control system. Nixon states that the portable computer communicates with a host system. Nixon states that the portable computer can send a command to the host system. Nixon shows diagrams of various graphical images displayed by the portable computer including bar graphs and conditions of process modules.

Nixon does not teach that a device can be used to sexually stimulate an individual. Nixon does not show that an animated display of a stimulation device is displayed on a remote computer. Nixon does not show any relationship between sexual stimulation and an animated display on a remote computer. Nixon does not show that the animated display can emulate the behavior of an electromechanical device.

The Prior Art Distinguished (Nixon)

The examiner relies on Nixon and Firouzgar to reject claims 3, 4, 7-11, 15, 16, 21, and 22 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). To render a claim obvious, the prior art references must include each and every element of the claim.

Claim 3 recites "wherein, an animated display emulating the behavior of the electromechanical device is displayed on the on the first computer." This limitation is neither taught nor suggested by Firouzgar or Nixon or the combination thereof. Claim 3 is therefore allowable.

Claims 4, 7-11, 15, and 16 depend from claim 3 and thereby contain all of its limitations. Claim 3 contains a limitation that is neither taught nor suggested by Firouzgar or Nixon or the combination thereof. Thus, claims 4, 7-11, 15, and 16 are allowable.

Claim 21 recites "wherein, an animated display emulating the behavior of the electromechanical device is displayed on the on the first computer." This limitation is neither taught nor suggested by Firouzgar or Nixon or the combination thereof. Claim 21 is therefore allowable.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21 and contains all of its limitations. Claim 21 contains a limitation that is neither taught nor suggested by Firouzgar or Nixon or the combination thereof. Thus, claim 22 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2207, under Order No. 58551-8001.US01 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date July 18, 2007

By



Brian R. Coleman
Registration No.: 39,145

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, California 94026
(650) 838-4300